

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 23 have been amended. New claim 32 has been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 23 is provided by at least the figures of the present application. New claim 32 is supported by at least original claim 30 of the present application. No new matter has been added.

#### **§103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsuyama (US 6,374,648) in view of Jaeb (US 2002/0003095). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Mitsuyama discloses an anti-theft implement having a case A composed of a box body 2, a cover body 4, and a hinge 3. The case A includes fitting grooves 9,9 formed at an upper side that is exposed to the hinge 3. A slider B is used to combine the box body 2 and the cover body 4 by being fit into the fitting grooves 9,9. In order to open the case A, the slider B must be completely removed from the grooves 9,9. This slider B is an independent piece separate from the case A and is not mounted to the bodies 2, 4 except when inserted in the grooves 9,9 to lock the case A. Mitsuyama fails to disclose or suggest any way of mounting or securing the slide B to the case A except for the inserted position within the grooves 9,9 when the case A is locked with the slider B.

Therefore, Mitsuyama fails to disclose or suggest "a lock slide mounted to the first security member and displaceable while remaining mounted to the first security member between an unlocked position wherein the security device can be opened and a locked position for maintaining the security device in the closed position," as required by claims 1 and 23. As noted above, Mitsuyama does not disclose mounting of the slide B to the case A while the case A is in the unlocked or open position. Jaeb fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mitsuyama as it relates to claims 1 and 23. Therefore, Mitsuyama and Jaeb fail to disclose or suggest every limitation of claims 1 and 23 and the claims that depend from them.

New Claim


New claim 32 is directed to the latch including a resilient magnetic material. Applicants submits that the new claim 32 is allowable for at least the reason it is dependent upon an allowable base claim, the allowable base claim 23 being allowable for those reason discussed above.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance. If a phone conference would be helpful in resolving any further issues related to this application, please contact Applicants' attorney of record, Gregory A. Sebald, Registration No. 33280 at 612-336.4728.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Dated: May 23, 2006

By   
Joshua N. Randall  
Reg. No. 50,719  
JNR:njo:ae